



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Studies of Sanskrit Words.—By EDWIN W. FAY, Professor
in the University of Texas, Austin, Texas.

I. Arvāñc-

IN his German etymological dictionary (English translation, s.v. Erde) Kluge, with some hesitation, connects Lat. arvum 'field, ploughed land' with Gr. ἔραζε 'earthwards.' In his English Etymology, s.v. earth, all this hesitation disappears, in view, I take it, of ON. jörvi 'ground,' not cited in the former work among the cognates. It is also to be noted that Vergil (Aen. 12,681) uses arvis as a virtual rendering of Gr. χαμᾶζε 'to the ground.'

There is a very obvious difficulty in the comparison of arvum with ἔραζε, viz., the vocalism. This difficulty may be surmounted, to the best of my knowledge, in but one way, by assuming a base ēr- 'arare,' to which the European base ar- (from ər-) would belong. This solution I have offered in my essay entitled A Semantic Study of the Indo-Iranian Nasal Verbs (Am. Jr. Phil., 26,389). There is, it must be admitted, not very much to justify a base ēr-. Skr. ārá 'awl': Gr. ἀρίς 'auger' is dubious because of OHG. āla. Latin ōra 'edge, point,' is also ambiguous, and so is ēr 'stachel-schwein,' which may well be for 'her', if Hesychian χήρ is genuine Greek, with a genuine χ. Not very conclusive is Skr. íriṇam (? from ər-) "brüchiges, unfruchtbares land." A vague connection with the root might be made out for Gr. ἐριφος 'kid' (if = "pricket"): Lat. aries 'ram' (cf. Umbr. erietu): Lith. éras (with ē) 'lamb.' But in any case, the vowel relations of arvum and ἔραζε are no harder to admit than those of Lat. aries: Umbr. erietu.

As a means of testing the correlation of arvum with ἔραζε I have made a study of the Sanskrit word arvāñc-, as it appears in the Ríg-Veda, and I attach some importance to the isolation of its formation, with the adverbial suffix -añc-, as compared with the isolated Greek word ἔραζε. I conclude from the data that follow that arvāñc- and the adverb arvák do mean "earthward(s)."

1. The Petersburg Lexica define our word as follows: a) herwaerts kommend, hergekehrt, zugekehrt, entgegen-kommend: b) diesseitig (only in grammatical and lexicographical sources, save the adverb *arvák*, which has literary attestation): c) unterhalb befindlich, nach unten gerichtet: d) in der nähe von (advb. only). The earliest citations for the sense c) are from AV. and ŚB., and consist of passages in which *arvāñc-* is contrasted with *ūrdhvás*. This contrast I would, however, see in RV. vii. 78. 1bc (B₂)¹:

ūrdhvá asyā añjáyō ví śrayante,

úṣo arvácā brhatá ráthena—vāmám asmábhyaṁ vakṣi,

“On high her rays are spreading abroad,

<Now> Uṣas earthward in thy mighty car wealth to us
fetch.”

This hymn may belong to a late middle period of RV. tradition as Arnold believes (see the table in PAOS. xviii. 353, and KZ. xxxiv. 341), but the chronology of the Vedic hymns can hardly tell against a word proved to be proethnic; and a hymn of the earliest period, if liable to popular rather than hieratic use, may have retained in all its working-over very early linguistic material (cf. Bloomfield, Proceedings, xxi. 41 ff. *pace* Arnold, *ibid.* xxii. 309 ff.).

2. Contexts are not wanting in RV. where a special sense seems warranted for *arvāñc-*. Thus in i. 92. 16 (A),

—vartír asmád² á . . . arvág rátham . ní yachatam

“unto our house—earthward—your chariot bring”,

arvág might well be taken as a mere adverbial repetition of *vartís*, and passages are still to be pointed out in which *arvák* seems to mean “ad nostrum fundum.” In some of these contexts previous translators have recognized the sense I would give to *arvāñc-*, and Sāyaṇa glosses *arvák* in v. 45. 10 (see 5 below) by *avāñmukhāḥ* ‘face-downwards.’

¹ After each hymn I put Arnold's indication of its age: A, archaic; B₁, early middle period: B₂, late middle period: C₁, early late period: C₂, later late period.

² This takes *asmád* as a poss. adj. = ‘nostrum’, identical with the compounding stem *asmad*.

viii. 14. 8 (B₂):

úd gá ājad āngirobhya āviṣ kṛṇván gúhā satíh
arvāñcam nunude valám,

“Showing the hidden, he drove forth the cows for the
Aṅgirasas,

And Vala he ‘cast headlong down” (so Griffith).

That arvāñcam nunude means ‘struck to the ground’ = (‘to his feet,’ cf. RV. i. 32. 8, B₂) seems to me most probable. Note the combination of the root nud with ūrdhvám ‘upwards’ in i. 85. 10 (B₂); i. 88. 4 (A).

Wilson, cited by Griffith, paraphrased x. 71. 9a (C₁),

imé yé nārvāñ ná parás¹ cáranti,

by “Those who do not walk (with the Brahmins) in this
lower world, nor (with the gods) in the upper world.’

3. In the following passages arvāñc- is combined with the root sad ‘to sit.’

iii. 4. 8cd (B₂): sárasvatī sárasvatébhīr ārvák
. . . barhír édám sadantu,

“May Sarasvati and her confluent rivers earthward
(come) . . . and sit down upon this grass.”

x. 15. 4a (C₁): bárhiṣadaḥ pitara ūty ārvág,

“Grass-sitting Manes come earthward to our aid (or
with aid).”

4. In the following the contrast of earth and heaven is clear.

i. 45.10ab (A): arvāñcam dāívyam jánam ágne yákṣva,

“Fetch-by-sacrifice to earth the celestial kind, O Agni.”

v. 83. 6cd (C₁) arvāñ eténa stanayitnúnéhy

apó niṣīñcānn ásurah pitá naḥ.

“Earthward in this thunder come,
dripping water, god our father.”

vi. 19. 9cd (B₂): á viśvátō abhí sám etv arvāñ

índra dyumnám svārvad dhehy asmé,

“From every side let him come earthward:
Indra, bestow upon us heavenly glory.”

¹ On parás, see 6 below.

vii. 83. 3 (B₂): sám bhúmyā ántā dhvasirá adrkṣata
 índrāvaruṇā divi ghóṣa áruhat
 ásthur jánānām úpa mām árātaḥ
 arvág ávasā havanaśrutá gatam.

“The earth-ends were seen dust-bewhirled;
 Indra-Varuna, my cry mounted to heaven:
 My enemies among the peoples encompassed me:
 Earthward with help, hearing my cry, ye came.”

x. 83. 6a-c (C₁): úpa méhy arvāñ—mānyo vajrinn-
 “Come earthward to me, lightning wielder, Manyu.”

5. In the large majority of instances arvāñc- is of vague significance. The gods are called upon to come and bless the worshipper. Obviously “come hither” makes a satisfying rendering for arvāñ yāhi, but “come down, come earthward” were equally satisfying. Arguing from the antiquity of the agricultural rites of worship, attested for instance at Rome in the ritual of the Fratres Arvales, and mindful of the etymological sense of ‘ploughland’ found in arvum, one might feel disposed to make something of

iv. 57. 6ab (C₁): arvācī subhage bhava síte vándāmahe
 tvā,

“Earthward, gracious one, turn thou, Furrow, we greet thee.”

Still, as so many other deities are summoned earthward, we can hardly lay much weight on the summoning of the “Furrow” earthward.

The following passages, though vague, have seemed, for one reason or another,¹ worthy of consideration.

ii. 37. 5ab (B₂): arvāñcam adyá yayyām nṛvāhaṇam
 rátham yuñjāthām ihá vām vimócanam.

“To come earthward to-day your man-bearing
 Car hitch up; here is your unhitching.”

Here arvāñcam is not attributive, but predicative, a sort of factitive to yuñjāthām; unless construed closely with yayyām.

¹ Chiefly because they show arvāñc- in combination, not directly with a verb of motion, but with one equal, by a sort of zeugma, to a verb of motion.

- iv. 4. 8a (B₂): árcāmi te sumatīm ghóṣy arvák,
 “I sing thy grace; sound it <back> to earth.”
- v. 45. 10cd (B₁): udná ná nāvam anayanta dhírā
 āśṛṇvatīr āpo arvág¹ atiṣṭhan,
 “Like a ship in water the wise launched him (the sun);
 The hearkening floods <of light descended> to earth
 and stood <there>.”
- vii. 18. 3c (B₂): arvācī te pathyā rāyā etu,
 “Earthward (? ad fundum nostrum) come thy path of
 wealth, <Indra>.”
- vii. 28. 1b (A): arvāñcas te hārayaḥ santu yuktāḥ,
 “Earthward be thy steeds yoked, <Indra>.”
- viii. 61 (50). 1 (A): ubháyaṁ śṛṇāvac ca na índro arvág
 idām vácaḥ
 satrácyā maghāvā sómapīṭaye dhiyā śáviṣṭha á gamat.
 “Let Indra hearken earthward to this our double song;
 <Moved> by our unanimous prayer, let Maghavan, the
 mighty, come hither to drink soma.”
- x. 89. 5d (B₂): nārvág índraṁ pratimānāni debhuḥ,
 “Nor have any counterfeits decoyed Indra to earth.”
- x. 89. 16d (B₂): tiró víśvāñ árcato yāhy arvān,
 “Past all (other) praisers (?), come down to earth”
 (ad fundum nostrum: cf. vii. 18. 3, and paragraph
 2, above).
- x. 129. 6c (C₂): arvág devā asyā visárjanena.
 “The gods are later than this world’s production”
 (Griffith).

No translation of this passage is likely to win conviction, even from its proposer, but I venture on

“<There came> gods to earth at its creation.”

6. I have reserved two passages for separate treatment.

- i. 164. 19ab (C₁): yé arvāñcas táñ u párāca āhur
 yé párāñcas táñ u arvāca āhur,

¹ Note the gloss of Sāyaṇa, mentioned above at the beginning of 2.

“The down <on the earth> they call the up <in the sky>;

The up <in the sky> they call the down <on the earth>.”

In this stanza we have some astronomical or cosmogonic riddle, and a real solution I do not pretend to offer,¹ but it is probable that páráñc- here repeats pára- in stanzas 17 and 18, where pára-² connotes ‘heavenly,’ as in the same stanzas ávara-, echoed in stanza 19 by arvāñc-, connotes ‘earthly.’ This interpretation shows points of agreement with Wilson’s paraphrase of x. 71. 9a (see in 2 above).

viii. 8. 23 (A): tríñi padāny aśvínor āvīḥ sánti gúhā
parāḥ

kavī rtāsya pátmabhir arvág jivébhyas pári,

“The three regions of the Ásvins are revealed
<which were> in hiding in-the-far-heaven;

The two seers of righteousness wing-their-way earthward
unto the living.”

The translation of parāḥ by “in-the-far-heaven” (= German “jenseits”), rather than by “before,” seems to me beyond question; and this would seem to fasten the sense of “earthward” upon arvák.

After the above tests of the special applicability of the rendering “earthward,” it seems not amiss to regard Skr. arvāñc- as a cognate of Gr. ἄρως, Lat. arvis (in Aeneid 12. 681).

Postscript.

The editors have asked me to add, for completeness’ sake, a word on (1) arvācínā- (arvācína-) and (2) arvāvát-. It is habitual to render (1)—construed like Lat. sublimis (Gildersleeve-Lodge’s Gram. §325. 6)—by ‘hitherward’ (= ‘to the worshipper, to me’), rather than by ‘earthward,’ and in all the usage of the word (fifteen cases) there is nothing, as Professor Hopkins observes, to prove the inadequacy of the usual rendering. The

¹ But we may note the Vergilian usage, Aen. 6. 481, of superi = ‘qui in terra (supra terram) sunt,’ for the usual superi = ‘caelestes.’

² See Grassmann’s Lexicon, s.vv. pára-, paramá-.

one difficult use is RV. vi. 25. 3 (A, in Arnold's system of dates):

índra jāmáya utá yé 'jāmayo
'rvācīnáso vanúṣo yuyujré
tvám eṣāṁ vithurá śāvāṁsi
jahí vṛṣṇyāni kṛṇuhí párācaḥ,

as to which Grassmann remarks in his *Lexicon* that here alone arvācīná- is used of other than friendly approach. But there need be no question of approach at all, for we may well take jāmáyaḥ and ājāmayaḥ as adjectives and arvācīnásaḥ as a substantive, in formation something like arvales, but in sense like vicini (fini-tumi) or Landsleute. The stanza does not lose in point thereby:

Indra, our kindred and non-kindred
Neighbours, that as enemies have united,—
Do thou in sunder their mightiness
Rive, their prowess; make them as strangers (=drive
them afar).

In the study of arvāvát 'proximity,' the salient fact is that it is never used save as an antonym of parāvát 'distance;' but, after a consideration of all the examples in RV., I feel free to say that 'distance' is not the only signification of parāvát (and its kin). Grassmann's *Lexicon* s.vv. pára- paramá-, suggests 'heaven' as a rendering, and renders parástāt by 'oberhalb'; while both Grassmann and the larger Petersburg *Lexicon* interpret tistrás parāvātaḥ by 'the three regions' (sky, air, and earth).

The connotation of 'sky' or 'air' ('aloft, on high') seems to me probable—what connotation is mathematically demonstrable?—for this group in the following instances. In iv. 26. 6 (B2) the falcon brings the soma-stalk from the parāvát (a-b), having taken it divó amúsmād úttarāt 'from yon remote sky' (d), and pādas ab, without the interpretative clause d, recur in substance in x. 144. 4 (A). In iv. 21. 3 (A), Indra is besought to come from (1) diváh 'the sky,' (2) pṛthivyāḥ 'the land,' (3) samudrād . . pūrīṣāt 'the sea-of-air,—i. e., from the three regions already mentioned: the stanza then adds (4) svāṇarāt 'from the light-realm' and (5) parāvátō vā sádanād ṛtása; I interpret (4) as a substantial repetition of (1) and in (5) I take sádanād ṛtása, which Sāyana glosses by meghalokāt 'from the cloud-space,' as a synonymous (explanatory) apposition with

parāvataḥ (which Ludwig renders by an adjective): thus (5) = 'from parāvāt, the cloud-space.' In. vi. 8. 4 (B₂) Mātariśvan is said to have brought Agni down from (his hiding place in) parāvāt, while in x. 187. 5 (B₂) Agni's birthplace is given as pārē rājasah 'in the far-off of the air.' In v. 53. 8 the Aśvins are summoned from the sky (divāḥ), the air (antārikṣāt), and from here (amāt), and besought not to remain afar, parāvataḥ 'from (=in) the parāvāt. Further, note viii. 12. 17 (A):

yād vā śakra parāvāti samudré ādhi mândase
asmākam ít suté raṇā sám indubhiḥ,

"Whether, O Might, thou joyest in parāvāt in the sea
<of air> [So Griffith supplies]

Delight in our pressing," etc.

In addition to these examples of the connotation 'sky' (air) for parāvāt (pāram), we may note the contrasting pair āvara-lower (and) paramā- 'highest,' especially in i. 164. 17 (C₁) avāḥ páreṇa parā enā 'vareṇa'. In the light of such instances we may note that in the remote Celtic branch Ir. eross, which Stokes (Fick's Woert. II. p. 37) gives as a cognate of Skr. parā-, means 'height,' which would tend to vindicate the sense of 'high' for proethnic pero-.

If parāvāt means 'sky,' what of its antonym arvāvāt? Note viii. 13. 15 (A):

yác chakrási parāvāti yád arvāvāti vṛtrahan
yád vā samudré ándhaso 'vitéd asi,

"Whether, O Might, thou art in parāvāt, or in arvāvāt,
Vṛtra- slayer,

Or else in the sea <of air>, thou art the protector of the
Soma-stalk."

If we are right in taking samudré of the 'air,' then pārāvāti and arvāvāti are the sky and earth, respectively.¹

¹ [Observe, however, that the same words are repeated in viii. 97 (86). 4, but filled out (after the invitation is given) in 5 as follows: yád vāsi rocané divāḥ samudráśyā' dhi viṣṭāpi, yát pāṛthive sádane vṛtrahantama yád antārikṣa ā gāhi, "or if thou art in the sky's brightness, (or) on the sea's expanse, (or) if on earth's seat, (or) if in the interspace (air), do thou come hither," where 'sea' is distinct from air, and earth and sky are separately contrasted. Ed.]

The semantic problem may be stated as follows: *pará-* meant (1) 'distant, far' but came, by a connotation which may have been proethnic, to mean (2) 'high, in the sky;' its antonym, *arvāñc-*, meant (1) 'earthwards, towards (on) the ground' but developed, under the influence of *pará* (1), the meaning (2) 'near.'

The following illustration furnishes an approximate parallel. In Latin, *domi* (*domum*) and *apud me* (*ad me*) became, in a restricted sense, synonymous: 'at (to) my house.' These synonyms must have played a rôle in the upgrowth of *domo doctus* for *ā me doctus* and of *domi habeo aliquid* for *mihi est aliquid* (cf. Lorenz ad Mil. Glor. 194), wherein the sense of '*domus*' has nearly vanished. Similar is the generalisation of *θύραζε* 'out,' French *fors / hors* ('Lat. *foris*), from which the sense of 'door' has vanished, almost or wholly; and in French *chez* the sense of Lat. *casa* is all but gone; and we no longer think of a hill when we say down or adown. In general, on such prepositional words (direction adverbs) derived from nouns, consult Steinthal-Misteli, *Abriss der Sprachwissenschaft*,² II, §4, p. 11 ff., noting especially Skr. *pārśvam pārśve-* 'adversus, ad, apud, prope.'

To say briefly what I think of the morphology of the group under discussion, I explain *arvāñc* as a terminal accusative **arvam* (or plur. **arván*) + a deictic particle *-*c(a)*, comparable with Gr. -*δε*; *-*c(a)* may be compared with Lat. -*ce*, and if it belongs to a different guttural series, the reason is that **arvamś-* has been attracted into a group with the other direction adverbs in -*āñc-*. Alongside of *arvācīnā* RV. exhibits a pretty large group of which *prācīnā* and *praticīnā* may be taken as representatives; *arvāvāt* is not to be explained as from *arvāñc*, but merely as a counterpart of *parāvāt*.

2. Náhus-.

In RV. viii. 8. 23 (above), the words *trīṇi padāni* call for interpretation: what are the three *paḍas*? Sāyaṇa interpreted them as the three wheels of the *Aśvins'* chariot. Griffith says heaven, firmament, earth. But the hymn itself mentions three places from which the *Aśvins* come, viz., *nāhus-* (stz. 3), *antárikśa-* (3, 4), *dyāús* (4, 7). *Dyāús* we know and *antárikśa-* we seem to know, but what is *nāhus*? I believe *nāhus* to be 'the night,'

cf. Gr. *νύχα* · *νύκτωρ*, *ἐννυχος*. This interpretation yields good results when applied to

vii. 6. 5bcd (B₂): *yó aryápatnīr uṣásas cakāra*

sā nirūdhyā náhuṣo yahvó agnīr

vísas cakre baliḥṛtaḥ sáhobhiḥ,

“Agni made the dawns noble-spoused,

Driving off the nights, strong Agni

Made the peoples tribute-bringers by his might.”

Here note the opposition of *uṣásas* and *náhusas*.

The base to which I ascribe Gr. *νύχα* and *náhus* is *s)nō(w)-gh-*, alternating with *s)nē(y)-gh-*, and refer for my conception of the phonetic problems involved to Am. Jr. Phil. xxv. 371 ff. 379 ff. Stripped of “root-determinatives,” the base in simpler form is *s)nē(y)-/s)nō(w)-*, and meant “to wrap,” cf. Skr. *snāyati* ‘wraps,’ Lat. *nuit* glossed by ‘operuit, texit.’ The word *náhus* belongs more closely with *náhyati* ‘binds, wraps,’ while Gr. *νύχα* has the vowel color of *nuit*. Lat. *niger* ‘black’ and noegeum ‘amiculi genus’ attest the *-ēy-* diphthong. In all this it has been assumed that the night was the “binder” or “wrapper up” of the day (cf. Am. Jr. Phil. xxv. 386, note 2). The base for “snow,” with a different final guttural, *s)nē(y)-gwh-*, has a cognate meaning, snow being conceivable as that which “wraps” (covers) the earth: cf. also Avest. *vafra-*: ‘snow’: the root *vap-* “to strew, weave.”

3. *vedhás*, ‘worshipper, pious; faithful, true.’

Uhlenbeck in his etymological lexicon groups together *vidátham* (with deaspiration) ‘congregation, assembly,’ *vidháti* ‘worships, honors, dedicates (to a god),’ and *vedhás* as defined above. For none of these words does he suggest further cognates, not even Avestan ones.

In view of the uncertainty in some few Sanskrit words, even the oldest (cf. Whitney, *Verb Roots*, sub the root *vṛh*, and Wackernagel, *Altind. Gram.*, § 161), between *b* and *v*, we may provisionally etymologize on our words as though they began with *b*. Then if we set down **bedhás* ‘fidus, pious,’ it becomes immediately apparent that **bedhás* and *fidus* are etymological cognates, which differ only in their stems, the former being an *-es-/os-* stem, the latter an *-e-/o-* stem. However, it must be observed that in AV. xix. 3. 4 the stem *védha* is found in a

variant reading for védya, while in old Latin fidusta (from *fidus-to-) occurs, defined by Paulus as "a fide denominata, eaque maximae fidei erant," a definition that would lead us to infer an Italic stem *fidus-: cf. also foedus and confoedusti.

The derivation of vedhás here suggested also accounts for vidátham, if etymologically defined by "federation." But vidhāti presents a harder problem. It would not be very well defined by *πείθει*, but is fairly well matched by Germ. *betet*, *beten* and *bitten*, being, according to many,¹ cognate with *πείθει*, *fidit*. But if Kern is right in referring these German words to Skr. *bádhathe* 'premit' (cf. the citation of the footnote), then it might be necessary provisionally to separate *vidhāti* from *vedhás*, and rather put it in a group with *bádhathe*. I have tried, however, in *Am. Jr. Phil.* xxvi. 179 ff., to reunite *πείθει* and *bádhathe* under the still remoter base *bhē(y)-d(h)* 'to split > <splice.' The semantic questions involved will now justify, I hope, a somewhat more detailed treatment, à propos of the problem presented by *vedhás* for *bedhás*.

Beside the root *bheidh* 'to convince'—though this meaning is far from being primitive—stands a root *bheid* 'to split.' My thesis is that these roots were originally but one. The variation of aspirate and sonant at the end of roots with nasal infixes is far too common a phenomenon to be called in question, and the nasal inflexion of Lat. *findit* 'splits,' Skr. *bhinátti*, *bhindánti*² fulfils the conditions. Further, a nasal inflexion of *bheidh* seems attested by Alb. *bint* 'I persuade,' if they are right who connect it with Gr. *πείθει*.³

If thus on the formal side we may regard *bheidh-/ bheid* as one root, it remains to bring in accord the figurative meaning of *bheidh* 'to convince' and the direct sense 'to split' attested for

¹ E. g., Osthoff, cited in Uhlenbeck's got. *Woert*, s. v. *bidjan*; Brugmann, *Grundr.* i. § 589; Kluge, *Etym. Woert.* s.vv.; Skeat's *Concise Etym. Dict.*, s.v. *bid*.

² It is entirely within the bounds of probability that *bheid-* 'to split' has been affected by a group-association with the root of Lat. *scindit*, Skr. *chinátti*, *chindánti*.

³ So, among others, Brugmann, in his *Grundriss*, and Prellwitz, *Woert.*, s.v. *πείθω*. G. Meyer, *Alban. Woert.*, s.v. *bint*, derives from *bhendh*, which is, in my opinion, itself but a derivative of *bhē(y)dh-*; see *Am. Jr. Phil.* xxvi. 181.

bheid-.¹ If we define Lat. *fidus* by 'open(ed), frank, sincere, loyal' we see how it may be cognate with *findit* 'splits, opens.' Similarly we may define the Homeric idiom *πείθειν φρένας* (*θυμόν*) *τινί* (*τινος*) by 'to open one's mind, convince,' comparing our own idiom "to open one's eyes;" *fidit* and *πέποιθε* may be rendered by 'opens (one's own heart) to (another), trusts.' The concrete sense of 'splits' is perhaps retained in *Iliad* 15, 26 *πειθοῦσα θέλλας*, which may be defined by 'findens procellas.' The locution *μισθῷ πείθειν* 'to bribe' is very like the Sanskrit compound *dāna-bhinnas* 'bestochen, bribed.'

To Lat. *foedus* I assign a semantic development somewhat different from that exhibited by *fidus* 'true.' In Sanskrit the ptc. *bhinnás* means not only 'split, opened,' but is defined in the lexicon of Boehtlingk by "verbunden mit, hängend-, haftend an;" cf. *vi-bhinnás* "unzertrennlich verbunden mit," *sambhinatti* "zusammen bringt, in Berührung bringt, verbindet, vermengt, sich zu jemandem gesellt," *bhiduras* "in nahe Berührung tretend—sich vermengend, sich vermischend mit," *bhittís* "a woven mat" (: Lat. *fides* 'strings, a lyre'). With these words Lat. *foedus* 'truce, league, compact' accords in definition and they show that in Sanskrit derivatives, at least, the root *bhid-* has developed the connotation 'to join.' Similar is Eng. *splices* 'joins (split rope-ends)', whose derivation from splits is clear; also, in the language of weavers and rope-makers, Germ. *scheren* 'to cut, shear' has acquired the sense of 'spannen;' cf. also Eng. *pieces* 'to join <pieces> together.' The semantic opposition of "to split" and "to join" is only apparent, and comparable with the conflict found in the pair sticks 'stecht' and sticks 'steckt' (cf. also stitches 'stecht, stickt;' and see Kluge's *Woert.* s.v. *stechen*).

But in demonstrating a root *bheid(h)* 'to split,' with the connotation 'to join,' the last word has not yet been said for *foedus* 'truce.' Touching *foedus*, I think of some primitive form of contract by indenture, some breaking of a *tessera hospitalis*, in which the breaking of the token was the chief symbolic act of

¹ I share Uhlenbeck's doubts whether Goth. *beidan* can be directly connected with Lat. *fidit* 'trusts.' But in view of MHG. *stecken* 'to remain fast, stick, bide' we may connect *beidan*, Eng. *bide* directly with *bheid(h)* to split, pierce.'

² Cf. Fr. *résoudre* 'to persuade,' from Lat. *resolvere* 'to open up' (?).

the treaty-making. Thus do we best account for the idiom *ὄρκια πιστὰ ταμεῖν* 'foedus ferire, icere, percutere,' which lends itself to the interpretation "symbola <pactionis> fissificare" rather than to "foederis causa <hostiam> sacrificare." No doubt, however, the cutting up of the animal sacrificed for distribution among the compact-makers was a part of the ceremonial (cf. Aristophanes, *Lysis*, 192; ? Vergil, *Aen.* 8. 641).

Returning now to *vedhás* 'fidus,' I conjecture that its orthography with *v* for *b* was primarily due to the association of forms of *b(h)eidh* 'to split, pierce' (cf. Goth. *beidan*, Eng. *bide*, Gr. *πεπιθοῦσα* as explained above) with forms of the Sanskrit root *vyadh vidh* 'to pierce' (cf. Lat. *di-vidit*); or, to put it concretely, I conjecture that **bedhás* 'apertus, aperto <pectore>,' 'fidus' has been assimilated to *viddhás* 'di-visus, apertus;' though it is of course not to be denied that *vedhás*, defined by 'apertus, etc.' is susceptible to immediate derivation from *vidh-yati* 'peirces.'

4. *vádhi*.

The close kinship of *vádhi* and its Greek synonym *ἰθρῖς* 'τομίας, castratus' is not to be called in question, despite their phonetic divergence. The phonetic difficulty is resolved by deriving *vádhi* from the Sk. root *vadh* 'to beat, slay,' and *ἰθρῖς* from a base *widh-*, found in Skr. *vidhyati* 'pierces,' Lat. *di-vidit* 'divides,' and further attested, I believe, in *ισθμός* (from **widh-tmos*, with *-tmos* from the root *tem*), '(mare) dividens.' The parallelism of *vádhis* (**wédhis*) and *ἰθρῖς* (*wídhis*) throws light on the Skr. root *vyadh* (not attested in RV.), which I take to be a blend of the root *vidh* (with grade forms in *vedh*) and the root *vadh*.

5. *sprśāti* 'touches, grasps, feels, besprinkles.'

Uhlenbeck (ai. Woert. s.v.) finds no sure cognates for *sprśāti*, but mentions the possibility that Goth. *faurhts* 'fearful' (without *s-*) is identical with the ptc. *sprštá* 'touched, stirred, moved.' [Professor Hopkins calls my attention to the fact that *sprštá* appears as *prštá* in RV. i. 98. 2.] I doubt not, however, that

¹ On the close correspondence of Latin and Sanskrit in parts of their vocabulary, see Kretschmer, *Einleitung*, 125, ff.

Gr. *σπαράσσει* 'tears, rends, mangles; mulcat' is cognate with *sprṣāti* 'touches; mulcet;' cf. Lat. *tangit* 'mulcet, mulcat.' Goth. *faurhts* leans to the violent sense of 'mulcat;' as a semantic parallel we may compare Gr. *ἐκπλαγείς* <'terror-> smitten.'

Wharton (*Etyma Latina*) sets down *spureus* as a cognate of *sprṣāti*, and I believe this to be correct. We may again illustrate by derivatives of *tangit*, viz., *contaminat*, *contingit* 'defiles,' *contactus* 'defiled; cf. also *tangit* 'smears.' The German word *ferch* 'dung' (without *s-*) perhaps belongs more closely with *spureus*. With these we might group Lat. *porcus*, supposing the pig to have been named (1) 'the dirty creature,' and not (2) 'the rooter' (*porca* 'furrow'). Still another possibility for *porcus* is (3) 'spotted, dark,' cf. Skr. *pṛśni* 'spotted, a cow,' Gr. *πέρκος*, *περκνός* ('spotted), dark,' *πέρκη* 'perch' (a dark or spotted fish, cf. our fish-name of "spot"). There is no inconsistency between (1) and (3), 'dirty' and 'spotted' being closely related notions, as Lat. *maculosus*, e. g., shows. And if *porcus* meant 'rooter' (2), it may still be a cognate of *σπαράσσει* 'tears, rends.' I see no reason to doubt, either, that *pṛśanī*, defined by Boehtlingk as "sich anschmiegend, zärtlich" (*mulcens*) belongs with *sprṣāti* (cf. also Whitney, *Roots, Verb-Forms*, etc, etc., sub *pṛś*), cf. *upa-sprṣāti* "zärtlich berührt, liebkost." With this group we may classify the cognates of Lat. *procur* 'suitor,' *precatur* 'entreats,' *presses* (a suit, request); *laccsit*, *flagitat*.'

6. *khudāti* 'futuit.'

Uhlenbeck defines *khudāti* by "stösst hinein (*kapṛthám*, *sapam*), and (s)*khidāti* by "reisst, stösst, drückt." No cognate of *khudāti* seems to have been pointed out.² If the long diphthong gradation *-ē(y)-/-ō(w)*, already referred to in this paper, is correctly assumed, then *khudāti* and *khidāti* go back to a common root (see Am. Jr. Phil. xxvi. 396). So far as signification goes, *khudāti* would seem but a specialization of *khidāti*, and we might explain its vocalism as something individual, due, to use the metaphor introduced by Bloomfield (IF. iv. 78), to a blend of *khidāti* and its synonym *tudāti* 'stösst, sticht, stachelt.'

¹ Eng. *entreats* derives from Lat. *tractat* 'handles;' cf. further, Goth. *bidjan*: Skr. *bádhathe* 'premit' (supra, p. 412).

² But now cf. Prellwitz, *Woert.* ² s.v. *κίσθος*; I would derive *κίσθος* from *khudhtos*, Lat. *cunus* from *khudhnos* or *khudnos*: base *khud(h)*.

But the infection of khidāti by tudāti may as well have begun in the primitive period as in the separate life of Sanskrit. Uhlenbeck remarks s.v. khidāti, "verwantschaft mit chināti is nicht undenkbar." In Latin both (per-)scindere (= chināti) and pertundere occur in the special sense of khudāti,¹ the former in Priap. 15. 5, 54, 77. 13, and the latter in Catullus 32. 11. If scindit and tundit thus cross meanings in Latin, we have some confirmation of the supposed association of ideas that changed khidāti to khudāti under the influence of tudāti.

If Lat. cūdit 'strikes, beats' corresponds with Skr. khudāti 'stösst hinein,' the recognition of the Italic cognate would forbid us to regard khudāti as khidāti inflected by tudāti. It would not forbid us to suspect that primitive khudēti is khidéti, with the vowel color of tudéti, though we should be bound to admit three roots meaning 'to strike, thrust, pierce, split,' whose weakest forms are; 1) (s)khid², 2) (s)khud, 3) (s)tud, (cf. Uhlenbeck, *op. cit.*, s. v., tomáras). The derivation of (2) from (1), inflected in its vowel color by (3), is purely glottogonic; not in any case a phonetic question, but rather a psychological question. Provisionally, leaving out the possibility that khūdāti is cognate with Lat. cūdit (: Germ. *hauen*, cf. Brugmann, *Grund.* 1^a § 639), we may include khudāti / khidāti among cases like those pointed out by Bloomfield in the essay referred to. Ultimately, perhaps, a psychological treatment of the vowel alternation in the spirit of Wundt's *Die Sprache* (I¹, p. 335 ff.) may be arrived at.

7. Skr. ámbaram.

Uhlenbeck asserts that no satisfactory explanation has been advanced for ámbaram, but it seems to me that an easy one lies at hand. The meanings we have to account for are (1) ambitus, vicinia, (2) amictus. It is phonetically allowable to connect amb- with ἀμφί, Lat. ambi-, cf. Skr. ámbu / ámbhas 'water' for the variation b / bh after nasals. By this explanation ámbaram (subst.) is morphologically comparable with ávara-

¹ Cf. Gr. κρούει, which occurs in the same special sense.

² Strong form (s)khēyd (: Lith. skėdziu, Lat. caedit, see Hirt, Ablaut. 67) : cf. Amphitruo, 159, quasi incudem caedant, where incudem caedant partakes of the nature of the etymological figure, as does the commoner locution incudem tundere.

‘lower,’ ápara- ‘further’ (adj.): ámbara- means ‘the surrounding.’ For the sense ‘amictus,’ note the “roundabout” of the sailor, and the style of cloak called “circular.” Compare too Sanskrit vásaḥ paridhānam.

8. Pratiśī in RV. iv. 3. 2d (B₁).

Agni is summoned in this stanza to a fire kindling. The general purport is clear, but there is a verbal difficulty in the last pāda,

imá u te svapāka pratiśī,

to wit, as to what substantive is to be supplied with pratiśī. Sāyaṇa supplies ‘flames’ or ‘hymns,’ Ludwig ‘gentes’ or ‘cives’ or even the ‘ladles of the sacrifice,’ and Grassmann supplies ‘libations,’ while Griffith follows Sāyaṇa. In support of the native interpretation I cite vii. 39. 1b (A)

pratiśī jūrṇír devātātim eti,

“The toward flame goes to the godhead.”

Here the situation is that the fire has been kindled and the flames ascend. In iv. 3. 2, Agni is invited to come and kindle the fire and the ‘toward <flames>’ are the ‘expectant flames’ unless, instead of jūrṇáyah, we supply samídhaḥ ‘kindlings, faggots.’ As to svapāka, Ludwig’s ‘selbst garer’ suggests to me ‘self-cooker, self-kindler.’